Attorney Docket No.: Q76684

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Application No.: 10/628,470

## **REMARKS**

Prior to the present Amendment, claims 1-24 were all the claims pending in the present application. Claims 1-21 remain rejected on the prior art grounds of record. Claims 22-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By this Amendment, Applicant has canceled claim 22 without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, upon entry of the present Amendment, claims 1-21, 23, and 24 will be all the claims pending in the application.

## I. Formal Matters

Applicant thanks the Examiner for initialing and returning the PTO SB/08 Form submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement of May 29, 2007, indicating that the documents cited therein have been considered.

## II. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-2, 7-8, and 13-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Appln. Publ. No. 2002/0154895 to Maruyama et al. ("Maruyama"). By this Amendment, claims 1, 7, and 13 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 22, which the Examiner indicated is allowable. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 1, 7, and 13 are now allowable. Since claims 2, 8, and 14 are dependent upon claims 1, 7, and 13, respectively, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

## III. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 3-6, 9-12, and 15-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Maruyama taken alone.

Attorney Docket No.: Q76684 AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Application No.: 10/628,470

Since claims 3-6 and 19 are dependent upon claim 1, claims 9-12 and 20 are dependent

upon claim 7, and claims 15-18 and 21 are dependent upon claim 13, Applicant submits that such

claims are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

IV. Allowable Claims

Claims 22-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would

be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim

and any intervening claims. Applicant submits that claims 23 and 24 remain allowable at least

by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 19, 2008

10